	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/869,135	OKU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.	1626
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>80</u>	
(1) <u>Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D</u> .	(3)	
(2) Stefan U. Koschmieder, Ph.D.	(4)	•
Date of Interview: 6 January 2006	Time: <u>10:30am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 112, first paragraph		
Claims discussed: 8 and 10		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		·
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief such as the provided in the provi	 The examiner will provide a writteness arate record of the substance of the 	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
		·
•		
Land: Forth		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A phone called was placed to Applicants' representative to discuss the reasons why the Amendment filed November 1, 2005 did not place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner stated that the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph would be maintained because of the multitude of diseases embraced by claims 8 and 10. The Examiner suggested canceling claims 8 and 10. Dr. Koschmieder stated that he would discuss the matter with Applicants.